

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-44 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 10, 19, 25, 31, 39, and 41 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 19, 25, 31, 39, and 41.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner accept the drawings filed on July 5, 2001.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 10, 19, 25, 31, 39, and 41 have been amended to include the limitation, “a repository for storing the workspaces of *a plurality of team members*” and “an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked *by the plurality of team members* to access the repository.” No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 1, paragraph 3 of the specification. It is believed that the claims amendments made require no new search or consideration by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 19, 20, 39, and 41-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by CVS Web Client, Version 2.2, 04/14/2001 (“CVS Web Client”). Independent claims 1, 10, 19, 39, and 41 have been amended to clarify the present invention as recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to teamware, a category of software that allows a team of people, including people distributed over multiple remote locations, to collaborate on projects.

Further, the present invention relates to managing teamware workspaces such that each team member working on the same project is capable of working in parallel to improve productivity, time-to-market, and quality of the product (*i.e.*, software). A workspace may be a directory, its subdirectories, the files contained in those directories, etc. (*see, e.g.*, page 2 of the Instant Specification). Specifically, the claimed invention recites a repository for storing workspaces for a plurality of team members, an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked by the plurality of team members to access the repository, and a server having at least one server object which implements the interface.

In contrast to the present invention, CVS Web Client provides a mechanism to edit files in a CVS repository (*i.e.*, database) using only a web browser. CVS Web Client provides software developers with a mechanism to manage changes within the source code, where CVS Web Client stores a record of all the changes to the source code, along with who made each change.

With respect to the rejection of the claims, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations “a repository for storing the teamware workspaces of *a plurality of team members*” and “an interface having a set of methods that can be invoked *by the plurality of team members* to access the repository.” Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on page 1, paragraph 3 of the specification. Specifically, this portion of the specification states teamware is a category of software “that enables a team of people, especially people distributed over multiple locations, to collaborate on projects.” Thus, teamware workspaces are workspaces specifically related to the software category of teamware, and management of teamware workspaces relates to managing access to and manipulation of workspaces shared by several members of a team that collaborate on projects using the teamware workspaces stored in a repository. Additionally, page 18, paragraph 41 recites “[t]he login/logout methods defined in the API (*see, e.g.*, Table 5) allow users to authenticate themselves and create a session on the teamware server 20, which is identified by session_id.” Thus, it is clear that multiple users use the teamware repository to access workspaces, and must be part of a team recognized by the teamware server in order to access the teamware workspace repository.

CVS Web Client fails to disclose the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Although, admittedly, CVS Web Client provides a repository for multiple software developers to

track changes made to the source code, CVS Web Client completely silent regarding the management of several *teamware* workspaces used by members of the same project. Rather, CVS Web Client discloses that only the source code for a particular project is stored in a repository, not teamware workspaces associated with projects that may be used by different team members.

In view of the above, it is clear that CVS Web Client fails to disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Thus, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over CVS Web Client. Dependent claims 2 and 4 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claims 10, 19, 39 and 41 include similar allowable subject matter (*i.e.*, “teamware workspaces for a plurality of team members,” and “...invoked by the plurality of team members”) and are patentable over CVS Web Client for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Associated dependent claims 11, 20, and 42-44 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 5-9, 12-18, and 21-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CVS Web Client in view of Tomcat, Version 3.1, 4/18/2000 (“Tomcat”). Independent claims 1, 6, 10, and 19 have been amended by this reply. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, CVS Web Client fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims of the present invention. Further, Tomcat fails to supply that which CVS Web Client lacks. Specifically, Tomcat is related to a tool (*i.e.*, a servlet container) used for developing servlet-based or Java Server Pages-based applications that serve as a stand-alone server. Tomcat is completely silent with respect to a teamware repository for storing teamware workspaces, where several team members access the repository to collaborate on projects. Instead, Tomcat discloses using a tool as an open-source implementation of Java Server Pages for developers to use as a server for building applications.

In view of the above, it is clear that CVS Web Client and Tomcat, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render the claimed invention obvious. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 6, 10, and 19 are patentable over CVS Web Client and Tomcat. Further

associated dependent claims 3, 5-9, 12-18, and 21-20 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 31-35, 38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over CVS Web Client in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,689,664 ("Narayanan"). Independent claims 31 and 39 have been amended to clarify the present invention as recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, CVS Web Client fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims of the present invention. Further, Narayanan fails to supply that which CVS Web Client lacks. Specifically, Narayanan relates to a system for sharing an interface between objects that saves significant mounts of system resources, such as memory, in an object oriented system. *See* Narayanan, Abstract. The interface shared by the system is an interface containing methods that perform a drag and drop operation. In addition, since one instance of the interface is shared among multiple objects, the system centralizes the processing performed by the methods of the interface. Narayanan is completely silent with respect to teamware workspaces shared among team members collaborating on a project. Instead, Narayanan focuses on shared objects, which are not the same as sharing complete workspaces designed to allow team members to collaborate on projects from multiple distributed locations.

In view of the above, it is clear that CVS Web Client and Narayanan, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render the claimed invention obvious. Thus, amended independent claims 31 and 39 are patentable over CVS Web Client and Narayanan. Further, dependent claims 31-35, 38, and 40 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159.009001; P5908).

Dated: *February 23, 2005*

Respectfully submitted,

By *Robert P. Lord*

Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant